

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Confirmation No.: 4510

Klas OLOFSSON

Date: October 24, 2007

Serial No.: 10/552,794

Group Art Unit: 3748

Filed: October 11, 2005

Examiner: Tu Minh Nguyen

For: METHOD AND DEVICE OF A PARTICLE FILTER FOR AN EXHAUST  
SYSTEM, SILENCER INCLUDING SUCH A DEVICE, AND A COMBUSTION  
ENGINE DRIVEN VEHICLE

---

VIA EFS-WEB

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Interview Summary**

Sir:

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesy of Examiner T. Nguyen for granting a telephone interview with Applicant's undersigned representative, which was held Tuesday morning, 23 October 2007. The following is a brief summary of that interview.

In the interview, the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6 and 9 were discussed. Applicant noted that independent claim 1 recites passing exhaust gas through a catalyst, including during bypassing of a filter. Independent claim 6 recites a catalyst and a device operable for causing the exhaust gasses to pass through the catalyst during bypassing of a filter.

In contrast, the Gillingham reference, and particularly the embodiment of Figs. 12-13 relied upon in the Office Action, do not teach a catalyst, nor that exhaust gasses are led through the catalyst, including during bypassing of the filter. There is no teaching or suggestion of a catalyst in Gillingham, only that the embodiment of Figs. 12-13 include duplicate traps (254, 256).

Further, independent claims 1 and 6 recite method and apparatus, respectively, to the effect that the during bypassing of the filter, the exhaust gasses are led through a space that surrounds the filter. In contrast, Gillingham teaches that the bypass gasses are led through a tube (260) in the center of the trap (256), and not through a space surrounding the filter as recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

It was agreed in the interview that claims 1 and 6 are distinguished over Gillingham. Examiner requested a written response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 setting forth the arguments in full, which would be met with a withdrawal of the Gillingham rejection and further action in due course.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON OCTOBER 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



David J. Torrente  
Registration No.: 49,099  
Ostrolenk, Faber, Gerb & Soffen, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: 212 382 0700

DJT:lf